

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 19, 21 and 22 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 15, 19, 21 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Brosey (US 6,948,186). Applicants kindly request that this rejection be reconsidered in view of the following comments.

Claim 1 recites the features of a header analyzing section for analyzing a header of an inputted packet and determining whether data stored in a payload is start data containing start information or other data; and a start data identifying section for generating information for identifying the start data in the buffer, based on the analysis result from the header analyzing section and the control by the buffer controlling section. Applicants respectfully submit that Brosey does not disclose or suggest such a combination of features.

With respect to the above-noted features, Applicants note that in the Office Action, the Examiner appears to have taken the position that the claimed “start data containing start information” corresponds to the new message start pointer (NMSP) of Brosey, and that the claimed “information for identifying the start data” also corresponds to the new message start pointer (NMSP) of Brosey (see pages 2-3 of the Office Action). Applicants respectfully disagree with such a position.

In particular, Applicants note that according to the claimed invention, a header of an inputted packet is analyzed in order to determine whether the data stored in a payload is start data containing start information (see “header analyzing section” of claim 1), the data stored in the

payload is extracted and stored in a buffer (see “data extracting section” and “buffer” of claim 1), and information is generated for identifying the start data in the buffer (see “start data identifying section” of claim 1).

Accordingly, as is evident from the features recited in claim 1, Applicants note that the start data containing start information is data that is stored in the payload of the inputted packet, while the information for identifying the start data in the buffer is information that is generated by the start data identifying section.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s position that the new message start point (NMSP) of Brosey corresponds to both of the claimed “start data containing start information” and the claimed “information for identifying the start data in the buffer”.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the foregoing reasons, that Brosey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted combination of features of a header analyzing section for analyzing a header of an inputted packet and determining whether data stored in a payload is start data containing start information or other data; and a start data identifying section for generating information for identifying the start data in the buffer, based on the analysis result from the header analyzing section and the control by the buffer controlling section, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Brosey, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Further, Applicants note that claim 1 also recites the feature of a decode section for reading out data from the buffer with a predetermined timing, and for performing a decode

process for the data read out based on the information for identifying the start data in the buffer, the information having been generated by the start data identifying section. In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to have taken the position that, in Brosey, the formation of complete messages from stored message portions takes place based on the new message start pointers (NMSP). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, Applicants note while the new message start pointer (NMSP) in Brosey is used to identify the start of a new message in a data stream so that the new message can be extracted from the data stream and stored in a buffer (see col. 6, lines 24-35), that Brosey does not disclose or suggest that the formation of complete messages is performed based on the new message start pointer (NMSP).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Brosey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in claim 1 of a decode section for reading out data from the buffer with a predetermined timing, and for performing a decode process for the data read out based on the information for identifying the start data in the buffer, the information having been generated by the start data identifying section. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Brosey, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claims 2-8 and 10-12, Applicants note that these claims depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claims 15 and 19, Applicants note that these claims recite the features of an analysis step of analyzing a header of an inputted packet, and determining whether data stored in a payload is start data containing start information or other data; an identifying step of generating

information for identifying the start data in the buffer, based on the analysis result from the analyzing step and the control from the control step; and a decoding step of performing a decode process for the data read out based on the start information.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Brosey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in claims 15 and 19. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 15 and 19 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 21, Applicants note that this claim recites the features of a header analyzing section for analyzing a header of an inputted packet, and determining whether data stored in a payload is start data containing start information or other data; a start data identifying section for generating information for identifying the start data in the buffer, based on the analysis result from the header analyzing section and the control by the buffer controlling section; and a decode section for reading out data from the buffer with a predetermined timing, and for performing a decode process for the data read out based on the information for identifying the start data in the buffer, the information having been generated by the start data identifying section.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Brosey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended 21. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 21 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claim 22, Applicants note that this claim depends from claim 21 and is therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brosey (US 6,948,186).

Claim 9 depends from claim 1. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Brosey does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious all of the features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

B. Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brosey (US 6,948,186) in view of Fuji (US 2002/0067744).

Claim 14 depends from claim 1. Applicants submit that Fuji fails to cure the deficiencies of Brosey, as discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 14 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 13 contains allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Shigeo HAYASHI et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/

By: 2008.10.09 16:51:06 -04'00'

Kenneth W. Fields

Registration No. 52,430

Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krq

Washington, D.C. 20006-1021

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

October 9, 2008